

REMARKS

Claims 1-21, 23, and 41 are pending. The Examiner's reconsideration of the objection and rejections is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks.

Claims 1, 9, and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Referring to Claims 1 and 23, the Examiner stated essentially that the limitation "wherein the active object is transferable" is not defined in the specification or claims.

Respectfully, Applicants point to, for example, page 25, line 6 to page 29, line 3 as describing sending and receiving an eCard. The description of sending and receiving an eCard supports a transferred active object.

Referring now to Claim 9, the Examiner stated essentially that the limitation "according to a preference of the second client" is not defined in the specification or claims.

Respectfully, Applicants point to, for example, page 3, lines 22-24 and page 12, lines 8-10, as describing limiting information that can be accessed through an eCard according to a client preference, e.g., a preference of a second client.

Respectfully, the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is requested.

Claims 1-8, 10-21, and 23 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Engstrom (US Patent Pub. 20020138286), in view of Bhoj et al. (USPN 6,304,892). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Engstrom and Bhoj teach or suggest all the limitations of Claims 1-8, 10-21, and 23.

Claims 1 and 23 claim, *inter alia*, “defining an access right of the second client, wherein the access right determines a portion of the electronic profile accessible to the second client via the active object; verifying an identity of the second client; and providing access to the portion electronic profile to the second client via the active object, wherein the active object is transferred to the second client from the first client.”

Engstrom teaches a method for generating personality profiles (see Abstract). Engstrom does not teach or suggest “providing access to the portion electronic profile to the second client via the active object, wherein the active object is transferred to the second client from the first client” as claimed in Claims 1 and 23. The personality profiles of Engstrom are used in accessing content pages without the need to disclose personally identifiable information to a content provider (see paragraph [0023]). The personally profiles belong to the user accessing information. This is clearly not analogous to a network accessible electronic profile of the first client accessible to a second client via an active object transferred to the second client from the first client, essentially as claimed in Claims 1 and 23. Engstrom fails to teach or suggest “providing access to the portion electronic profile to the second client via the active object, wherein the active object is transferred to the second client from the first client” as claimed in Claims 1 and 23.

Bhoj teaches sharing of selective management information of independently administered systems securely in a federated environment (see col. 4, lines 11-27) – the federated environment being composed of different administrative entities cooperating to provide a service (see col. 4, lines 32-34). Bhoj does not teach or suggest “providing access to the portion electronic profile to the second client via the active object, wherein the active object is transferred to the second client from the first client” as claimed in Claims 1 and 23. Bhoj teaches restricting information

sharing across domains (see col. 5, lines 59-64) by means of an SLA converted into machine readable contract templates and disposed between any two data service systems (see col. 6, lines 62 to col. 7, lines 8). The SLA is not transferred to a data service system. Therefore, the SLA is not analogous to “providing access to the portion electronic profile to the second client via the active object, wherein the active object is transferred to the second client from the first client” as claimed in Claims 1 and 23. Accordingly, Bhoj fails to cure the deficiencies of Engstrom.

The combined teachings of Engstrom and Bhoj fail to teach or suggest “providing access to the portion electronic profile to the second client via the active object, wherein the active object is transferred to the second client from the first client” as claimed in Claims 1 and 23.

Claims 2-21 depend from Claim 1. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claim 1.

At least Claim 10 is believed to be allowable for additional reasons.

Claim 10 claims, “wherein the active object enables the second client to contact the first client.”

Engstrom teaches a chat session in which personality profiles are used to relate personality characteristics (see paragraph [0040]). Engstrom does not teach or suggest that an “active object enables the second client to contact the first client” as claimed in Claim 10. The personality profiles of Engstrom include no facility for enabling contact. Indeed, Engstrom teaches that the personality profiles may be generated dynamically for use in association with a chat session, implying that the chat session is first established followed by the generation of the personality profiles. Therefore, the personality profile cannot be used for enabling contact, as contact is first established then the personality profile is generated. The personality profiles

merely convey characteristics. Nowhere does Engstrom teach or suggest that the personality profiles “enables the second client to contact the first client” as claimed in Claim 10.

Bhoj teaches a data management system (see Abstract). Bhoj does not teach or suggest that an “active object enables the second client to contact the first client” as claimed in Claim 10. The SLA’s of Bhoj merely express agreements between parties (see col. 6, lines 15-27). The SLA’s of Bhoj do not able contact. Therefore, Bhoj fails to cure the deficiencies of Engstrom.


The combined teachings of Engstrom and Bhoj fail to teach or suggest an “active object enables the second client to contact the first client” as claimed in Claim 10.

Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

New Claim 41 reinstates cancelled Claim 22. Claim 41 depends from Claim 1. Claim 41 is believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claim 1.

For the forgoing reasons, the application, including claims 1-21, 23, and 41, is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Nathaniel T. Wallace
Reg. No. 48,909
Attorney for Applicants

Mailing Address:
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889